

# United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/510,663	10/07/2004	Masanori Ogawa	2710/73136/DSD	4926	
75	90 02/03/2006		EXAM	INER	
Donald S Dowden			WOODWARD, ANA LUCRECIA		
Cooper & Dunh	am				
1185 Avenue of the Americas			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
New York, NY	New York, NY 10036			1711	

DATE MAILED: 02/03/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
	10/510,663	OGAWA ET AL.				
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit				
	Ana L. Woodward	1711				
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	• •	•	SS			
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.  - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.  - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period was reply to the period for reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tim within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from cause the application to become ABANDONEI	ely filed s will be considered timely. the mailing date of this comm O (35 U.S.C. § 133).	unication.			
Status						
1)[X] Responsive to communication(s) filed on	ovember 21, 2005					
•	action is non-final.					
3) Since this application is in condition for allowar	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is					
closed in accordance with the practice under E	in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.					
Application Papers  Olimposition of Claims  4) Claim(s) is/are pending in the application 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdraw  5) Claim(s) is/are allowed  7) Claim(s) is/are rejected.  7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.  8) Claim(s) is/are objected to.  Application Papers  9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner  10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) access that any objection to the objected to by the Examiner of the objected objected of the objected of the objected of the objected of the objected	vn from consideration.  r election requirement.  r.  epted or b) □ objected to by the Edrawing(s) be held in abeyance. See ion is required if the drawing(s) is obj	37 CFR 1.85(a). ected to. See 37 CFR 1	` '			
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119						
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) All b) Some * c) None of:  1. Certified copies of the priority documents 2. Certified copies of the priority documents 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priori	s have been received. s have been received in Application ity documents have been receive (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	on No d in this National Sta	ge			
Attachment(s)	о <b>п</b>					
Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)     Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	4)  Interview Summary ( Paper No(s)/Mail Da					
3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date	5) Notice of Informal Pa		2)			

Art Unit: 1711

## **DETAILED ACTION**

## Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

1. Claims 1-3, 5-7 and 9-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

In claim 1, last line, "said polymner (misspelled) alloy sheet" lacks express antecedent basis.

The claimed term "modified" is indefinite as to scope and meaning. Applicants' argument that modified polyphenylene ether refers to a blend of PPE with polystyrene is not commensurate in scope with the present claims.

Claim 15 is indefinite for depending upon a cancelled claim.

### Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102/103

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

- (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.
- 3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
  - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Art Unit: 1711

4. Claims 1-3, 5-7 and 9-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over U.S. 6,045,883 (Akiyama et al) as per reasons of record.

The presently claimed masking member relates to a sheet manufactured by vacuum and/or pressure forming, preferably having a thickness in the range between 0.1 mm and 1.5 mm (claim 9). Akiyama et al disclose sheets having a thickness of 0.5 mm produced from compositions similar to those of applicants, that is, compositions comprising polypropylene, polyphenylene ether and compatibility agent wherein the polyphenylene ether is dispersed in a matrix of the polypropylene resin. See the experimental sheets having a thickness of 0.5 mm prepared from the exemplified compositions (column 18, lines 30-32). Since the sheets of the reference are structurally the same as applicants', it is reasonably believed that said sheets meet the requirements of the presently claimed masking member.

The preambular "for attaching to a part of an article to which a coating should not be applied" is not accorded any patentable weight because it merely recites the intended use of the claimed sheet structure. A recitation of the intended use of the claimed invention must result in a structural difference between the claimed invention and the prior art in order to patentably distinguish the claimed invention from the prior art. If the prior art structure is capable of performing the intended use, then it meets the claim. In this case, no structural difference is between the claimed invention and the prior art.

## Response to Arguments

5. Applicant's arguments filed November 21, 2005 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Art Unit: 1711

It is maintained that no difference, structurally or chemically, can be seen between the sheets of Akiyama et al and those defining the presently claimed masking members. The sheets exemplified by the reference are not only made from the same composition but also have the same thickness as those presently claimed. The preambular "for attaching to a part of an article to which a coating should not be applied" is not accorded any patentable weight because it merely recites the intended use of the claimed sheet structure. A recitation of the intended use of the claimed invention must result in a structural difference between the claimed invention and the prior art in order to patentably distinguish the claimed invention from the prior art. If the prior art structure is capable of performing the intended use, then it meets the claim. In this case, no structural difference is between the claimed invention and the prior art.

#### Conclusion

6. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Art Unit: 1711

7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Ana L. Woodward whose telephone number is (571) 272-1082. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday (8:30-5:00).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, James J. Seidleck can be reached on (571) 272-1078. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (tolf-free).

Ant L. Woodward Primary Examiner Art Unit 1711

\*\*\*